

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Ra Maat Ptah Atum, <i>aka</i> James Jordan, III, # 231341,	)	C/A 4:05-3360-CMC-TER
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
-versus-	)	
	)	
Anthony Padula, Warden; Jon Ozmint,	)	<b>OPINION and ORDER</b>
SCDC Director; State of South Carolina; SCDC;	)	
United States; United Nations; Florence County;	)	
Mark Sanford, Governor of South Carolina;	)	
Samuel B. Glover, Director, Dep't of PPPS;	)	
Gwendolyn A. Bright, Director,	)	
Parole Board Support Services; South Carolina	)	
Dep't of PPPS; Marc H. Westbrook, trial judge;	)	
Julie Lee, investigator; NFN Holler, police officer;	)	
NFN Kyser, police officer; Charles Condon, former	)	
S.C. Attorney General; William Bryan Dukes,	)	
former A. A.G.; Paul M. Burch, trial judge;	)	
Robert Wells Lowman, PCR attorney; Louis Farrakah;	)	
Bill Clinton, former President; Michael Moore, former	)	
SCDC Director; David Beasley, former SC Governor;	)	
Sgt. NFN Parnell, Librarian at Lee; Lt. NFN Davis,	)	
Lee CI; Rickie Harrison, Warden at Kershaw;	)	
Tom Smith, Assistant Warden at Turbeville;	)	
C/O NFN Thomas, Lee CI; Sgt. NFN Lloyd, Lee CI;	)	
IGC NFN Mitchell, Lee CI;	)	
Sgt. NFN Rhodes, Lee CI;	)	
Sgt. NFN Green, Lee CI; All Congress, Judicial and	)	
Executive members of the United States in the Masonic	)	
Order since 1996-2005; All United Nations members	)	
in the Masonic Order since 1996-2005;	)	
C/O NFN Sturkie, Lee CI; C/O NFN Gathers, Lee CI;	)	
C/O NFN Austin, Lee CI; Masonic Order;	)	
Dudley Saleeby, Jr.; W. Harry Conner, Jr.;	)	
John C. Jepertinger, and United States Magistrate Judge	)	
Joseph R. McCrorey,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint raising a variety of allegations against many defendants, including former President Bill Clinton, and "all Congress, Judicial and

Executive members of the United States in the Masonic Order since 1996-2005.” Plaintiff complains of a vast conspiracy formed with the express purpose of keeping him incarcerated after he was allegedly unlawfully convicted. Plaintiff also has filed several motions for injunctive relief in this matter.<sup>1</sup>

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation. On August 18, 2006, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process, and that this complaint be deemed a “strike” for the purposes of the “three strike” rule of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and Recommendation and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff has filed no specific objections to the Report, although he filed two motions for injunctive relief after the Report was filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with

---

<sup>1</sup>Plaintiff also has a habeas corpus petition pending in this court. *See Atum v. Ozmint*, D.S.C. C/A No. 3:05-3361-CMC-JRM. Plaintiff has filed material in this case which includes both civil action numbers. Some of this material appears to pertain to the habeas petition only. However, out of an abundance of caution, this court will consider this material to the extent it is applicable to the current matter.

instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report and Recommendation only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”) (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and the Plaintiff’s motions, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order. Plaintiff has raised no specific objections to the Report and Recommendation in his filings made after the Report’s issuance. Plaintiff’s complaint fails to state a viable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this matter is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process, and shall be counted as a “strike” under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). All of Plaintiff’s pending motions in this matter are hereby **denied**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina  
September 7, 2006